

Gaithersburg Day Laborer Task Force Meeting  
February 21, 2006, 7:30 p.m.  
Casey Community Center, Room A

I. Approval of Summary of 2/14/06 Meeting

**A motion was made to approve the February 14, 2006 Gaithersburg Day Laborer Task Force Meeting Summary. The motion passed.**

II. Report & Discussion: Option A – “Day Laborer Centers”

Subcommittee A leader Cathy Drzyzgula reported on the subcommittee’s visits to Day Laborer Centers in Silver Spring, Wheaton and Herndon. In order to ensure consistency, questionnaires were used to guide the interviews with center staff and users. The visits generated massive amounts of information which the subcommittee is currently working to incorporate into their draft research report. Information is also being gathered on national centers. Subcommittee A will provide a draft of its report to the full task force prior to the next task force meeting scheduled for February 28, 2006.

III. Report & Discussion: Task Force “Charge #4”

Task Force member Michael Wiencek presented information gathered in regard to Charge #4 - “Develop specific criteria relating to a location for a new day laborer center that would be funded and operated by Montgomery County.” Information contained in the PowerPoint presentation was based on research areas identified in the “Charge # 4” spreadsheet. It was noted that a copy of the PowerPoint presentation would be distributed to all task force members for review/comment. The presentation identified research areas such as:

- Site & layout (favored industrial site)
- Zoning
- Access
- Transportation
- Proximity (pro & con) to variety of uses including:
  - Residential
  - Business
  - Government offices
  - Schools
  - Police stations
  - Public transportation
- Building characteristics

Following the presentation task force members engaged in a discussion in which the following comments were made and questions posed:

- Zoning for industrial uses include several different classes – would like to see those classes identified. It was also requested that information on special exceptions to zoning be included.

- Include labels on site maps identifying important aspects of potential sites (major intersections, bus stops...)
- Regarding proximity, was walking distance to day laborers homes considered? (Response: More emphasis was placed on proximity to public transportation. A suggestion was also made that the County consider a program to provide bus passes to day laborers.)
- Does task force assume that the day laborer problem and resolution will exist for years? (Length of time needed could affect type of solution.)
- In regard to process, should a list of criteria be developed for sites or should potential sites be identified and then studies undertaken to determine what is around them? (It was noted that criteria is important but it is helpful to show test sites as well. It was noted that it is also important to identify what is not considered an appropriate fit.)
- It was understood that the task force was not given the task or authority to pick a site, but it was thought that it would be helpful to have some possible sites in mind from which to draw criteria.
- It was thought that examples of potential sites could be useful to the Mayor and City Council.
- Regarding a potential center, it was thought that the City was looking for a retrofit rather than looking to acquire a site and build a new facility.
- Do we need to know what sites are available for rent?
- Disagreed with recommending that the site be near a police station as it could send a misleading message that problems would be inherent with such a use.
- Regarding criteria, Labor Ready operates in a manner similar to day laborer centers and it may be helpful to visit the Shady Grove location to see what surrounds that site.
- It was noted that uses would determine space needed. Classrooms and space to house other social service components would require a larger facility.

As the discussion drew to a close, one member stated that they believed there was a zero percent chance that on April 1, 2006 there would be a site picked and a lease ready to be signed. It was stressed that Grace Church would not provide any services after April 1. Subsequently, there may be a need to look at plans similar to those being considered in Herndon. Currently, the Herndon Center is little more than a canopy, but they are pursuing plans for a hard-roofed screened building. The estimated cost is approximately \$30,000. It was suggested that the City might want to consider an intermediate structure while continuing to study the needs associated with a more permanent site. It was noted that "siting is difficult and, if done in a hurry, could cause problems. A two-stage approach would be a wise approach." Along those lines, it was suggested that short-term sites and long-term sites be considered. Furthermore, it was suggested that any site evaluation be done in coordination with the City's Master Plan to avoid any conflicts in regard to development/redevelopment plans.

#### IV. Old Business

##### A. Vote on Task Force Final Report: “Charge #1”

It was noted that the final report was still being compiled but copies would be distributed to task force members at the end of the meeting to enable them to review the report prior to its being voted on at the next meeting.

#### V. New Business

##### A. Report Process Guidelines

In order to facilitate the process of generating reports, Chair Prentiss Searles introduced a set of “Report Process Guidelines.” (A copy is included as an attachment to this summary.) In reviewing the guidelines a clear distinction was made between “research reports,” which contain factual information, and the “option report,” which will contain recommendations to be presented to the Mayor and City Council. (The factual reports could be included as an appendix to the option report.) It was noted that once the factual reports were completed, the task force would start looking at developing practical options.

In attempting to separate factual information from recommendations and conclusions, it was asked if the process of evaluating centers doesn’t require that some conclusions be drawn in regard to what works and what doesn’t. It was stressed that as much as possible should be stated in terms of facts. (50 day laborers showed up and 30 were hired.) (The model for assigning work at the “X” Center is as follows...) It was noted that opinions gathered as research, such as those obtained through interviews with day labor center staff and users, should be included in research reports.

In laying out the process for transitioning from factual reports to the option report, it was noted that each task force member would be asked to provide a list of options, identifying pros and cons for each option. Input from all members would then be compiled into one document and returned to task force members for ranking. It was noted that the draft work plan had been modified to provide time to work on drafting the options. One additional change included moving the third bullet from March 14 to March 7. (A copy is included as an attachment to this summary.)

The Report Process Guidelines also outlined the process for submitting amendments to reports as well as the process for offering a dissenting opinion. The task force decided that the number of task force members needed to support a dissenting opinion in order for it to be included in a report was four members.

## VI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

### Attachment 1

#### **Research Report**

Definition: Compilation of research (facts) regarding options A –E.

Process:

- Subcommittee gathers information in regard to their respective options.
- Subcommittee members provide input to members designated to write report.
- 1<sup>st</sup> draft (rough draft) given to subcommittee members to review and provide any additional input or changes.
- 2nd draft sent to full task force for review. Any additional input or changes are to be submitted to the subcommittee leader. (If no changes, this draft could serve as final research report.)
- Final research report sent to full task force for review/approval.

#### **Research Report Amendments**

Definition: Factual information discovered after the report had been finalized and deemed worthy of inclusion.

Process:

- Addendum is submitted by task force member and voted on by the full task force.

#### **Options Report:**

Definition: Report details options based on the facts in the Research Reports and Amendments (if any). Final report is to be presented to the Mayor and City Council.

Process:

- TF Members provide their Options with their list of pros and cons to Cindy Hines by March 13 at noon
- Cindy compiles all Options and pros and cons and emails to TF (March 13)
- Discuss and rank Options and consolidate pros and cons as appropriate (March 14 and 21)
- Finalize Options and vote

#### **Dissenting Opinion (For use with final report.)**

Definition: Opinion offered in conflict with majority view on conclusions from research reports and or final options and recommendations?

Process:

- May be offered by any board member but must be supported by minimum of four (4) task force members to be included in report.

## Attachment 2

### Day Laborer Task Force Draft Work Plan

February 7 –

- **Charter 4: “Develop specific Criteria relating to location for a new day laborer center”**
  - Outline Siting Issues (see last page of worksheets)
  - Identify volunteers for committee
- **Option A: Survey Approval (Action: vote on “Standardized Form” or “Worksheet”)**
- **Option E: Do Nothing – Report and Discussion**
- **Discuss final comments on Charter 1 Report**

February 14

- **Vote on Final Charter 1 Report**
- **Vote on Final Option E – Do Nothing Report**
- **Option B: Ordinances – Report and Discussion**
- **Option C: Utilize Existing Employment Centers – Report and Discussion**

February 21

- **Option A: Day Laborer Centers – Report and Discussion**
- **Charter 4: Report and Discussion**

February 28

- **Option B, C: – Review and Comment**
  - **Option A: Review and Comment**
- (Draft Reports Due 2 days before meeting (Feb 26))*

=====

March 7

- **finalize reports**
- **Review Charter 4 Report and Identify specific criteria relating to a location for a new day laborer center**

*(Revised reports due 2 days before meeting (March 5))*

March 14

- **List practical options based on reports**
- **Brainstorm and document Pros-Cons**

March 21

- **Practical Options language**
  - Finalize
  - Prioritize
  - Vote
- **Vote on final reports**
- **Finalize siting criteria**

March 28

- **Finalize recommendations and Siting Criteria**
- **Vote**
- **Discuss presentation to Mayor and Council**